

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
September 16, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on September 16, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Resource Action Identification Forms
Attachment 4	Cultural Resources Work Group Resource Action Matrix
Attachment 5	Cultural Resources Work Group Resource Action Matrix Definition Sheet

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – August 19, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the August 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C56:	Confirm whether Cherokee interviews were sent to Cherokee nation.
Status:	Janis Offermann, Cultural Resources Area Manager with DWR, reported that DWR did not send the interviews because they were waiting for approval signatures by the Cherokee participants. Janis said she would ask Helen McCarthy to send the individual interviewees a copy of their interview.
Action Item #C57:	Send a copy of Thorne's report to Eric Ritter.
Status:	DWR completed this action item.
Action Item # C58:	E-mail completed Resource Action Identification Forms to Janis Offermann.
Status:	Janis said she has received some forms from CRWG participants.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Mark Selverston with the Sonoma State University consulting team gave an update on the archaeological studies to date. Mark described the field effort and informed the group that SP-C1 is essentially complete. He said that an additional 2,300 acres had been surveyed this year, resulting in the identification and recording of an additional 137 sites. The current site total is 846. He informed the group that under SP-C2, the sites will be evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The evaluation will be conducted in two modes: prehistoric and historic. A scope of work and research design for the evaluation of historic-era sites has been completed and submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and other agencies for review. The goal is to initiate the work next month, allowing two seasons to complete the studies. Eric Ritter with the BLM clarified that this work plan is draft and subject to change and asked if there would be a separate study for the prehistoric component. Mark answered that CSU, Sacramento will be conducting the prehistoric evaluation, for which no work has begun.

One participant asked how the evaluation studies fit with the relicensing schedule. Mark answered that the hope is to complete the studies later this year and in 2004, before the Historic Properties Management Plan is completed. He added that if the Lake Oroville water level drops below 690 feet (below last year's level) the field crews could evaluate additional land within the fluctuation zone.

The CRWG discussed the issue of debris in Lake Oroville potentially affecting sites during collection and removal efforts. Janis Offermann noted that O&M staff now knows where sites are, so booms can be placed appropriately to avoid impacts while DWR determines if another location could be used for debris collection and removal in the future.

Eric Ritter asked when a final decision on the APE would be made. Janis Offermann responded that she expects to get more information from the other work groups regarding their proposed resource actions for consideration of a possible expansion of the APE. The Facilitator reminded the group that the working APE has always been referred to as dynamic and that it would be considered as the existing project boundary for now, pending information that suggests it should be revised.

One participant voiced concern that if land outside the APE has not been surveyed, there is no way to assess the impacts that may be occurring. Mark Selverston said one could assume impacts are occurring at unknown sites outside of the project boundary, but he would rather survey more of the presently-recognized APE rather than extend the survey outside the project boundary. Janis Offermann added that Helen McCarthy would probably be recommending a revision and extension of the APE based on her ethnographic studies. Art Angle, representing Enterprise Rancheria, mentioned that French Creek, which flows into the lake, was a major village site. He suggested that French Creek be included in the APE. Janis suggested that Helen would be ready to share her recommendation for expansion of the APE late this year or early next year and added that FERC and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will make the final determination. The APE is specific to cultural resources and does not impact the project boundary for other resources.

Eric Ritter asked Mark Selverston about the selection criteria for the sites to be evaluated. Mark explained the objective is to have a selection of different property types to ensure an evaluation that encompasses all the different site types, particularly any unique ones. He stated that the evaluation would be aimed at a variety of locations and geographic conditions, such as the fluctuation zone, wooded areas, high-use areas, and remote sites to determine possible district boundaries. The Facilitator added that artifact collection during the historic-era evaluation study is limited to those items in danger of vandalism or imminent loss. Eric commented that a Native American monitor should be present while historic-era sites with prehistoric components are evaluated.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

The Facilitator announced that there would be no Maidu Advisory Council Update because that group has not met since the last CRWG meeting.

Resource Action Discussion

The Facilitator recapped the Resource Action discussion from the August CRWG meeting. She told the group that the objective is to provide the Plenary Group with a list of proposed resource actions that the work group recommends for further analysis in the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA). The Plenary Group expects to begin receiving recommendations from all of the work groups in October. Chris Acken from DWR explained that she revised the Cultural Resources Goals and Resource Actions table to reflect the changes made during the August

meeting and displayed the revised table as an overhead. The Facilitator noted that all completed Resource Action Identification Forms related to cultural resources are being collected in a binder and made available for review. (The CRWG will receive copies of these RAIF's for review and comment.) She suggested that the authors briefly describe their completed forms (see Attachment 3). The Facilitator added that the near-term goal is to discuss any comments regarding the proposed resource actions at the October CRWG meeting and be prepared to come to agreement on a list of resource actions to move forward to the Plenary Group and the PDEA Team for further analysis.

Janis Offermann stressed the importance of the identification forms and reminded the CRWG that proposed resource actions without the details provided in the completed forms would not likely receive the same level of analysis those with completed forms will receive. She added that all of the proposed resource actions on the matrix would be forwarded with whatever information is available.

The CRWG reviewed the Resource Action worksheet to identify which proposed actions do not have forms submitted to date. Art Angle announced that the Tribal Unity Council (the three Oroville federally recognized Tribes) had purchased property and are considering donating the land (outside the project area) for a Native American cultural center/museum. The Facilitator asked if the Tribes intend to submit a Resource Action Identification Form for that action, and Art stated that the Tribes hoped that it could be an Interim Project. The Facilitator said that wasn't possible as all Interim Projects had been completed and no other such projects would be entertained. Art then agreed to ask the Tribal chairs about preparing a Resource Action Identification Form for a cultural center and report back to the CRWG. The CRWG also discussed the proposed resource action to construct a cultural center and the optional locations that have been proposed. The CRWG agreed that coordination is needed with on-going resource action development in the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group and existing funding for a cultural center at Riverbend Park.

The Facilitator distributed the CRWG Resource Action Matrix (Attachment 4). She explained how the matrix is being used in other work groups and how the Cultural Resources version was developed and what it includes. She also distributed a CRWG Resource Action Matrix Definition sheet (Attachment 5) explaining information contained in the matrix. The CRWG agreed to review the matrix and provide comments at the next meeting. Janis Offermann confirmed that DWR may complete Resource Action Identification Forms for some of the proposed resource actions.

Franklin Martin, a Maidu elder, wanted the CRWG to be aware that the term "Kon Kow" is not an accurate spelling or pronunciation of the name. It is actually "Ko yo kowis". "Ko" means, "white"; "yo" refers to a flower, be it the plant or the seed, and "kowis" translates as "mother earth". Therefore Kon Kow Maidu would roughly translate as "white flower people of mother earth". The work group thanked Mr. Martin for this clarification.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

DWR agreed to distribute complete packages of submitted Resource Action Identification Forms to the CRWG for review by the first week of October. The CRWG agreed to review the forms and provide any comments at the next CRWG meeting.

The CRWG agreed to meet as follows:

Date: October 21, 2003
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: Mooretown Rancheria

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the CRWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item due date.

Action Item #C59: Distribute Resource Action Identification Forms to work group for review and comment.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: October 3, 2003

Action Item #C60: Evaluate the Recreation and Socioeconomics WG resource action for a cultural center at Riverbend and consider merging with similar action in CRWG.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: October 21, 2003

Action Item #C61: Review Resource Action Identification Forms and be prepared to discuss comments at October CRWG meeting.

Responsible: CRWG

Due Date: October 21, 2003